

DOCKET NO: 242519US0CONT

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE

IN RE APPLICATION OF :  
TAKASHI MAEDA, ET AL. : EXAMINER: S. HENDRICKSON  
SERIAL NO: 10/656,147 :  
FILED: SEPTEMBER 8, 2003 : GROUP ART UNIT: 1754  
FOR: PROCESS FOR PRODUCING :  
MESOPHASE PITCH BASED ACTIVE  
CARBON FIBER, MESOPHASE PITCH  
BASED ACTIVE CARBON FIBER AND  
ELECTRIC DOUBLE LAYER  
CAPACITOR

REPLY BRIEF

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
ALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA 22313

SIR:

Applicant respectfully replies to the Examiner's Answer dated August 21, 2007.

**I. Reply**

The Examiner Argues that that the combination of Maeda (US 6,118,650), Anani (US 5,439,756), Neat (US 5,030,523) and the Applicants' own admissions render obvious Claims 10-22.

Applicants respectfully submit the combination of the references, along with the alleged Applicants' admission, does not describe or suggest all of the features of, for Example, Claims 10 and 11, and the claims depending therefrom, and thus, cannot render obvious the claims.

Claim 10 contains, as a feature "subjecting the positive and negative electrodes to a charge/discharge treatment in which the capacitor is charged at constant current density and

an increasing voltage until the voltage exceeds 2.5V up to 3.5V..."

Claim 11 contains the feature "the current is applied at constant current density and at an increasing voltage until the voltage increase exceeds 2.5V up to 3.5 V..."

The Examiner relies on column 4 of Anani for a charging scheme (see page 3 of the Examiner's Answer). However, Applicants note that Anani, at column 4, lines 30-31 describes only "constant current applied across the second electrode and the third electrode."

Further, Anani, at column 4, lines 35-36, describes that "both the current and the voltage could be varied." Applicants note the conjoining term "and" is employed by Anani, and that this conjoining is reinforced by the term "both."

Thus, Anani either teaches charging only at constant current and not varying the voltage, or varying both the voltage and the current. Had Anani meant to vary only the voltage or only the current, the alternative term "or" would have been employed, not the term "and," and the term "both" would have been excluded (e.g., "the current or the voltage could be varied" would have been employed by Anani).


Accordingly, Anani fails to describe or suggest the feature of Claims 10 and 11, and the claims depending therefrom "of charging at constant current density and an increasing voltage," and in fact "teaches away from" this feature, and the remaining references do not remedy the deficiency of Anani.

Because the combination of references does not describe or suggest all of the features of Claims 10 and 11, and the claims depending therefrom, and "teach away from" one of the claimed features, the obviousness rejection should be withdrawn, and the Final Rejection be reversed.

Application No. 10/656,147  
Reply Brief  
Reply to Examiner's Answer of August 21, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.  
Norman F. Oblon



---

Charles J. Andres, Jr., Ph.D.  
Attorney of Record  
Registration No. 57,537

Customer Number  
**22850**

Tel: (703) 413-3000  
Fax: (703) 413 -2220  
(OSMMN 08/07)